Bonn Gets An Atomic Veto, P. 4

Press Ignores Senator Engle's Plea for A Less Rigid Policy Toward Red China, Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 21 JUNE 1, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Ugly Questions Unanswered In That Lynching

In The Untold Story of Little Rock (*Saturday Evening Post*, May 23), Virgil T. Blossom, the former school superintendent, criticizes the failure of the Justice Department "to indict or prosecute a single individual involved in mob action to thwart integration, although more than 50 were arrested by local police." The untold story of the Poplarville lynching is proceeding along the same lines. The Federal government has withdrawn from the case, and handed over the results of an FBI investigation to Governor Coleman of Mississippi. Instead of summoning a special grand jury, Governor Coleman says he will await the regular grand jury next November. By November the ashes will be cold.

Victim Just An Untermensch

Those wise in the ways of official double-talk will note the peculiar wording of the Attorney General's announcement. It says the decision to withdraw was "based upon a ruling that FBI investigation had clearly established that the persons responsible for the death* of Parker had not violated the Federal Kidnapping Statute, and no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained." This is tantalizing. It is "clearly established" that the anti-kidnapping law was not violated, i.e. the murdered man was not taken across State lines. But what of the Civil Rights statutes which make it a crime for a State official to conspire with a lynch mob, or even to fail in his duty to protect against it? Of this other possibility, we are told only that "no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained." For lack of evidence? The atmosphere? Because witnesses might fear reprisals from State officials? And why the word "successful"? Even an unsuccessful Federal prosecution may serve as a deterrent. Were this not the murder of one whom we white Americans consider, to borrow the German word with all its ugly implications, an *untermensch*, the Attorney General would never be able to get away with such meagre explanation.

The doubts raised by the cryptic wording of the press release are sharpened by the letter New York radio station WMCA received from Poplarville, Miss., in answer to a $5,000 reward offer. The well-known Negro journalist Ted Poston was allowed to read the letter. In the *New York Post* of Friday, May 22, he reported it "named an elected official of Pearl River County as a close collaborator" of the lynch mob. This official arranged to have the Negro prisoner transferred back to Poplarville from a safe jail in Jackson, and served as "lookout", telling the mobsters where the jail keys could be found. Station WMCA officials verified the accuracy of Mr. Poston's report when we phoned them and added that they were trying to retrieve the letter from the FBI before it could be handed over to Mississippi authorities, lest the writer of it be exposed to retaliation. Why *was* Parker moved back to Poplarville? And why was the jail unguarded when the lynch mob arrived? Was County Attorney William Stewart, the responsible official, questioned?

The morning this issue went to press, Governor Coleman was to testify before the Hennings committee against civil rights legislation. We are waiting to see whether any Senator asks him about these loose ends. Will anyone question him about the mysterious suicide attempts by Poplarville's jail janitor, Houston Amacker, and Helen Van Ness "a woman prisoner who", according to an AP dispatch from Poplarville (*N. Y. Post*, May 12) "witnessed the abduction." Both are white. Shouldn't these witnesses be moved to a safer place?

Never A Harsh Word for Racists

We invite the attention of the Hennings committee, too, to the House Appropriations testimony by J. Edgar Hoover quoted in the box on this page. Why is he so venomous and suspicious about anyone who seeks to help the Negro? Why does he, so vocal on the dangers of Communism, never raise his voice on the dangers of racism, though a sense of rankling injustice on the part of a newer Negro generation may some day tear our great cities apart? Year after year his testimony chimes in with Southern racist attempts to picture the Negro's struggle for justice and equality as a Red plot. How reliable are FBI investigations of lynchings when its chief approaches the problem in the same lurid frame of reference as the more benighted elements of the South?

Same Cracked Record

"Attorney General Bruce Bennett of Arkansas testified yesterday the Arkansas Legislature's Special Education Committee 'is convinced racial unrest in Arkansas was deliberately planned by the Communist Party.' Bennett presented to a Senate Judiciary subcommittee the opposition of his state to civil rights bills."

—Associated Press from Washington, May 21.

"The Communist Party, USA, poses a formidable domestic threat. . . . Diligent efforts are being made to infiltrate Negro and labor groups, so as to create agitation and confusion. . . . We now have 155 known, or suspected, Communist front and Communist-infiltrated organizations under investigation. These front groups provide a fertile auxiliary corps of dupes, sympathizers, misguided pseudo liberals. . . . Supplementing this group are some men and women who pretend to be interested in measures to solve racial . . . problems. Actually they . . . are exploiting shamelessly racial, labor and welfare issues in carrying out the Communist Party line."

—J. Edgar Hoover testifying on the 1960 budget to House Appropriations Com., released May 11.

***"Death", not "lynching". Note how delicately the words have been chosen, as if to spare Southern susceptibility.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Excerpts from Senator Engle's Largely Ignored Senate Speech of May 21 . . .

The extent to which the reactions of the press are conditioned by official policy was again demonstrated by the almost complete blanketing given Senator Clair Engle's full dress speech in the Senate May 21 calling for a more flexible China policy. Though the newly elected California Democrat's speech brought a friendly response from Democratic Senators as different as Morse, Gore, Proxmire, Long and Dodd, though Clark of Pennsylvania pointedly praised Engle for being "more realistic" than his predecessor Knowland, the speech was largely ignored by newspapers outside Washington. We present striking excerpts from it here, along with significant glimpses of testimony on China policy released the day before from the House Appropriations Committee. These show the interrogation of retiring Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Robertson by Congressman Meyer of Vermont, who campaigned on a platform calling for recognition of Communist China.

The Engle speech and Senate reactions to it should be read also as background for the forthcoming Harriman visit to China. When former Secretary of State Dean Acheson appeared at the State Department to get a passport for the former Governor of New York, two elder statesmen of the Democratic party were joining in a mass foray to break down the Chinese Wall we have ourselves erected to keep our newsmen out of China, and to make way for a change in China policy. It should be remembered that Acheson, while rigid on European affairs, was preparing for a more flexible position on China in the winter of 1949-50 when he was thwarted first by the McCarthy onslaught (in which the China lobby played a major part) and then by the Korean war.

The box below, correcting the distortions of the State Department on the question of newsmen for China, is useful background for its grant of a passport to Harriman as a "bona fide" newsman (for North American Newspaper Alliance). Hope for a change in the Far East is in the air.—IFS.

". . . The State Department [Senator Engle began] regards this area of our foreign policy as one that should not be touched. I do not see why our policy in China should be any more sacrosanct than our policy in Europe. . . .

". . . in a general way we are aware that the sleeping Asian giant has awakened; that colonialism is dead . . . what the people really want, regardless of the form the revolution takes . . . (is) to replace poverty with plenty . . . inequality with equality. . . . We cannot dispose of this community of interest by attaching labels to the effect that this or that country is Communist or neutral or a staunch ally. . . . The assumption that we can or should guide this change in our own image is itself a denial of the very equality and right of self-determination these nations of Asia are seeking. . . .

"I do not contend that we can or should recognize the Mao government under the conditions of hostility which now prevail. . . . I cannot take the position that the Mao government should represent China in the United Nations until changes take place. . . . I suggest the need for examining the many possible alternative middle courses . . . which may serve the national interest 10 years from now far better than our present policy. . . .

The Secret War Against China

Mr. [Wm. H.] MEYER (D. Vt.). Could you describe briefly the activities of the CIA from Formosa, Formosa against China, the overt actions from 1950, 1954, 1958, and then indicate how these actions themselves may have contributed to the hostile and aggressive attitude of the Chinese Reds?

Mr. [Walter S.] ROBERTSON [Ass't Sec'y of State for Far Eastern Affairs]. I could not, Mr. Congressman. I suggest that you summon Mr. Allen Dulles down to testify about his activities abroad.

Mr. MEYER. The reason I ask this question is that it is definitely stated that these actions are affecting American foreign policy and, therefore, they are within the realm of your jurisdiction, as I see it. It would seem to me that you should know something about it and be able to comment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can sincerely say I do not think the activities of the CIA in Asia have been contrary to American interests. To the contrary, I feel they have served American objectives effectively.

Mr. MEYER. You don't feel that they have contributed to the hostility and the acts of the Chinese Reds, which they have done more or less in retaliation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed, I don't.

—Mutual Security Act of 1959, exec. hearing April 21 before House Foreign Affairs, released May 20.

Our Own Chinese Wall

"It is simplicity itself to respond to a threat by attempting to build a military, economic and psychological wall around China. This response of containment . . . is the 'maginot line' response. It is the 'moat' psychology of medieval days. . . . It denies the United States the advantage of those relationships essential to affect change. . . . Among most of our allies and the neutral nations of Asia it puts the United States in the ludicrous position . . . of attempting to escape behind the flimsy curtain we have created, rather than facing the reality of Communist China. . . . These allies seem embarrassed at having to defer to the efforts of the U. S. to keep alive the myth that Communist China does not exist.

"At the opposite extreme, two allies—the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China on Formosa—hold an interest in having the U. S. involved in a total war with Communist China . . . they employ every device and opportunity available to identify the U. S. with the eventual liberation of the mainland. The U. S. is placed in the position of being the dog wagged by the tail. . . . In sharp contrast [to the Geneva talks on Berlin] our China policy for all practical purposes rules out the use of instruments other than the ultimate recourse to war. . . . Even Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter S. Robertson testified to the effect that the participation of China would be necessary if any arms inspection system were to be effective. . . .

Senator Engle Corrects State Dept. Distortions About Newsmen to China

"It was charged by the Chinese Communists that we would not grant them reciprocity. What they meant by reciprocity was that we should lift our passport regulations and grant 26 visas to 26 unknown people without individual application. . . . The Secretary of State practically invited them to make an application."

—Ass't Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter S. Robertson April 21 before House Foreign Affairs on the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (released May 20), in answer to a question about why the 26 U.S. newsmen granted passports for China couldn't get in.

"We should be willing to negotiate the entrance of Chinese correspondents to the United States on a basis of reciprocity and equality with U. S. correspondents admitted to China. We should be willing to place the issuance of visas to the Chinese on the same basis and under the same controls as now apply to citizens of the Soviet Union provided that the Chinese are willing to admit American correspondents."

—Sen. Clair Engle (D. Cal.) U.S. Senate May 21.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Challenging Our Sacred Cow and Calling for A New China Policy

Preventing or Provoking Aggression?

"We aim at preventing aggression. This is a worthy objective, but . . . such aspects of our relations as the trade embargo; the boycott on travel; our refusal to negotiate on questions of substantive importance at a level higher than the Ambassador level . . . our measures which have been interpreted as threatened liberation—all these go beyond what would be necessary to halt any aggression . . . there is even good reason to believe that in carrying out these measures we are provoking political aggression. . . .

"A few weeks ago, President Eisenhower ruled out fighting a ground war in Europe. How much more reason for ruling out a ground war in the vast expanse of China? . . .

". . . the present trade embargo . . . creates a future reliance upon Moscow for technicians and for spare parts. It serves as a reason for a small army of Soviet technicians in China. . . . On the basis of the epithets directed by high-ranking Chinese officials toward the Soviet Union during the Hundred Flowers experiment; on the basis of the hard bargaining which accompanies each Sino-Soviet trade agreement . . . on the basis of overtures which already have been made by China to discuss trade with the U. S., there is fairly good reason to assume that . . . a normal working relationship could be established . . . the ties binding the Communist bloc together would be weakened and China's ties with the free world would be strengthened. . . .

Military Rathole Economies

Mr. [Alvin M.] BENTLEY (R. Mich). Do we have any hope, with respect to Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan, where so much of this money is going, that by building up these military establishments and the economies of these countries, have we any guarantee that those economies will become so attractive that their Communist counterparts might thereby be attracted to come over on our terms and not on theirs?

Mr. [Walter S.] ROBERTSON [Ass't Sect'y Far Eastern Affairs]. I don't think, Mr. Congressman, that as long as it is necessary to maintain military forces in these three countries of the size and magnitude we now have to maintain in view of the threat opposing them, that we can do much more than to keep their economies from deteriorating, plus a small measure of advance toward viability.

—Mutual Security Act of 1959, exec. hearing April 21, House Foreign Affairs Com., released May 20.

No Elections on Formosa Since Chiang Arrived

Mr. [Wm. H.] MEYER (D. Vt.). Aren't they [the Formosans or Taiwanese] also claiming they are not represented in their own governments at all proportionately?

Mr. [Walter S.] ROBERTSON [Ass't Sec'y of State for Far Eastern Affairs]. You will certainly find dissidents among the Taiwanese as you will in every country.

But insofar as their local governments are concerned, the Taiwanese have a large responsibility.

The Federal Government—that isn't a good name for it—the National Government of the Republic of China is largely in the hands of the mainland Chinese. . . .

Mr. MEYER. Have they had a free election, and are they represented at all?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed they do have elections for their local governments.

Mr. MEYER. I am speaking of the whole—

Mr. ROBERTSON. There hasn't been any election for the legislative Yuan [the "Congress" of Formosa] since the Government moved to Taipei [i.e. since it fled from the mainland].

—Mutual Security Act of 1959, exec. hearing April 21, House Foreign Affairs Com., released May 20.

The Stakes Which Call for A Change

"Free Asia endorses the legitimate measures of the U. S. to prevent Communist aggression. But when the balance of Asia opposes those provocative aspects of U. S. policy which go beyond the need of containment, when the balance of Free Asia registers even a partial lack of confidence as a result of the failure of the U. S. to establish more constructive relations with China, the evident conclusion is that some change in our China policy would not result in the Communist domination of all Asia. To the contrary, such change is necessary if we are to have the continued confidence of the peoples of Asia. . . .

"I think we have to make a distinction between our obligations to the Nationalist Government as a government on Formosa and to this same government as the government of all China. . . .

"The challenge to our foreign policy in the next decade is to prevent the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union. The resulting economic, political, and military collosus would include nearly one-third of the world's population. . . ."

Our First India-Born Congressman Elicits An Admission About Formosa

Mr. [D. S.] SAUND (D. Cal., first Indian-born American in Congress). Mr. Secretary, I am sincerely disturbed when I hear an Assistant Secretary of State in the year 1959 make the statement that the people of Formosa—because their standard of living is a little better today—are satisfied with a foreign people governing them.

Mr. Secretary, the European colonial powers had the same belief a quarter century ago. They honestly and sincerely believed that they had conferred so many benefits on the colonial people that the colonial people were really happy with their situation. . . . In spite of what happened in Indochina, what happened in Indonesia, what happened all over the world, for the Department of State to honestly believe that the people of Formosa are happy with their situation under the Chinese or anybody else, that is something very, very serious.

I would say this—I won't deny that we have to hold Formosa. Maybe like the British had to hold Cyprus. That is one thing, but to believe that the Formosans voluntarily accept this situation and are happy to have the Chinese come come there and rule them, will be a very serious mistake in my opinion.

Mr. [Walter S.] ROBERTSON [Ass't Sec'y of State for Far Eastern Affairs]. Judge Saund, I should like to emphatically say that I did not make the statement which you charge me with making.

Mr. SAUND. If you didn't, I am very happy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All you have to do is to read the record of what I said. I didn't use the word 'happy' once. I said that the farmers on Taiwan were enjoying a better standard of living than they ever enjoyed before. I said the merchants were more prosperous than they had ever been before. I did not say that they were happy about the Chinese coming over there from the mainland.

—Mutual Security Act of 1959, exec. hearing April 21, House Foreign Affairs Committee, released May 20.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crucial But Unnoticed Effect of the New Nuclear Arms Training Agreements

Giving Bonn A Veto Over Any Plan for An Atom-Free Central Europe

The texts of the actual agreements to train German, Dutch, Turkish and Canadian forces in the use of nuclear weapons are not yet at hand as this is written, but we notice an interesting difference among them in the summaries sent to Congress by President Eisenhower with his special message on the subject.

While the agreement with Canada for the transfer of nuclear information and military equipment may be terminated by either party on one year's notice, the agreement with West Germany provides that the pact can be terminated only by agreement of both parties.

This amounts to giving the West Germans a veto over any possible arrangements to create an atom-free zone in Europe. We grant them a power over our foreign policy we do not give our Canadian neighbors. In the middle of the first stage in East-West negotiations, we cut down our freedom of action and make it subject to Bonn's wishes. No matter what the Russians may offer in return for an atom free central Europe, this agreement—if accepted by Congress—will make impossible any such deal unless Bonn agrees, and Bonn is set on having a nuclear West German army, as is the Pentagon. Through Bonn, the military will determine policy.

Sideshows Which Distract Attraction

To conclude such an agreement in the midst of the negotiations now getting underway at Geneva is neither good faith nor good sense. It reflects the anxiety of the American and German military chiefs to let nothing interfere with their plans to proceed with the nuclearization of war. This is the main drive of policy—the talks on testing and the talks on Germany are side-shows which distract attention from the main event.

It is said that the warheads will be kept in our custody but this is only the first stage. Plans were disrupted by the restrictive amendments imposed by Anderson and Holifield last year on the nuclear arms give-away bill asked by the Administration. The ultimate plan is to give atomic arms to all our allies. An anonymous article, The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban, in the May issue of *Air Force Magazine* (put into the Congressional Record April 30 by Congressman Hosmer of California) provides a preview of these plans. They envisage "small combat teams armed with portable nuclear weapons, which would combine the invulnerability of guerrillas with the firepower of divisions"—and give desperadoes like Rhee and Chiang increased potential for trouble.

Congress by joint resolution within 60 days can block these agreements. Even a losing fight against them would help educate the country and slow up the next step, which is to hand over custody of the atomic arms themselves. Can peace groups arouse the country in time?

Free World Crisis on Capitol Hill

In our world crusade for freedom, our government recalls the broad-minded anti-Semite: some of our best friends are dictators. This makes embarrassing two resolutions newly introduced in Congress. One by Senator Long is designed to set up international arrangements for the trial of fugitive dictators. Long wants us to make clear that we do not propose to grant sanctuary to "the Batistas, Jimenezes, Perons, Farouks, Bao Dais" nor to let them use foreign aid funds "to live it up on the Isle of Capri and the French Riviera." The other, by Congressman Saund (D. Cal.) would ask all nations receiving military assistance to guarantee freedom of speech and press.

Since the Saund resolution would disrupt all our military allies in Asia and the Long resolution would alarm friends in Latin America like Trujillo, we suggest the State Department ask both legislators in for private talks.

The casuistical task should not be beyond the young men trained by Father Walsh at Georgetown for our diplomatic service. Ours is the free world; freedom includes the freedom to be unfree; the Soviet Union forces its satellites to be unfree, but we let them be free or unfree as they please; the existence of so many dictators in the free world thus proves that it is really free. As for the swag with which dictators flee, to question the source of private funds would be to question the moral foundations of capitalism which rest firmly on the ancient maxim, "pecunia non olet", or no matter how you got it, it still smells sweet.

Reprints of Our Special Issue on the Radiation Hearings Still Available In Bulk at 3 Cents Each

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/1/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An Independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.: $6 in Canada: $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED